EXHIBIT C

Dockets.Justia.com

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

Certified Copy

FACEBOOK, INC., CASE NO. C 07-01389 RS

Plaintiff,

v.

CONNECTU LLC, et al.,

Defendants.

The above-styled cause came on for hearing on May 23, 2007 at 9:28 a.m. before The Honorable Richard Seeborg, United States Magistrate Judge.

APPEARANCES:

ON BEHALF OF PLAINTIFF:

ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE, LLP
By Theresa A. Sutton
1020 Marsh Road
Menlo Park, CA 94043

ON BEHALF OF DEFENDANTS:

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER, LLP
By Scott R. Mosko*
3300 Hillview Avenue
Palo Alto, CA 94304

*Via phone

the parties can in good faith kind of delineate the boundaries of what goes to specific jurisdiction.

I'm aware that there are instances where there is an argument perhaps that there is some overlap, but I can tell you that I will not look with great favor on battling on that question in the form of some sort of discovery dispute.

I mean, I may limit you in terms of time and I'll trust you folks to work it out.

MS. SUTTON: Okay, well the issue did arise earlier and that's the only reason I'm bringing it up is so we can sort of foreclose that whole discussion and --

THE COURT: What was the -- the issue arose in what respect?

MS. SUTTON: Earlier in this case, we had the exact same situation, that's why I'm a little anxious about it.

So the original individual defendants moved to quash for lack of personal jurisdiction, the court ordered personal jurisdiction discovery, we tried to take it, there was a lot of motion practice because there was some resistance.

When we eventually got around to asking the questions, and you see some of the transcripts in the record here, Mr. Mosko and his partner in the Massachusetts action objected to our asking questions about the actual what was going on, the activity that took place, which leads to specific jurisdiction.

And then in the California case, Mr. Mosko actually went as far as moving for sanctions against us for asking certain questions.

So I want to avoid that completely.

THE COURT: I understand.

MS. SUTTON: And just for --

THE COURT: For what it's worth, again, I'm not going to bar issues that aren't before me yet, but in terms of my understanding, you're trying to establish whether or not there is specific jurisdiction.

It really does go to the activities involved in this particular dispute that have an impact on this forum, and by definition, that is going to involve some inquiry into what went on in conjunction with these claims.

And there is no way around that because you're not talking as you would be on the general jurisdiction prong of your activities of the entity or the person's activities in the forum generally;

we're talking now about what's connected up with this dispute.

By definition, that is going to require some analysis and some inquiry of the overlaps with the claims in the case.

But, so I can't give you any better sense of that other than to tell you that if I get some emergency motion where I'm called to rule on the distinction, if the question is does this go beyond the jurisdictional question, I'm not going to be happy.

But I don't know what you do with that, but there we are.

MS. SUTTON: That's fine.

THE COURT: Okay, so go ahead.

MS. SUTTON: In terms of the 30(b)(6) witness, the issue we had in January was that Mr. Taves was not prepared to testify as to topics, and I just want to make sure that whoever they designate is going to come prepared, and if the court could speak to that.

THE COURT: Well, again, I don't want to just give all sorts of generalized comments, but you know, people's obligations under 30(b)(6) are quite clear: You have to -- the party designating the 30(b)(6) deponent has to do their -- make their best effort to identify someone who has the best knowledge that that entity can come up with about the particular subject area, and it may involve some review of materials to get them up to speed.

But, it is also the case that some entities simply can't find anybody who is in a position to testify, and it really is -- if I get the impression that people have done the best that they can to designate somebody to cover the areas, the fact that every single issue may not be subject to a final examination, you know, I understand that.

At the same time, if I get the impression that people are, you know, hiding the ball, I'm not -- you know, that's not adequate. But beyond that, I have to actually see the particular -- you know, the particular 30(b)(6) and the issues involved beyond giving fairly general comments that I don't think are probably all that useful.

If you'll look in the advisement rules to 30(b)(6), I think if I recall correctly, it pretty much tells you how you're supposed to operate and so I expect you guys to do that.

Okay, you had also asked for some

STATE OF COLORADO)
) ss. CERTIFICATE
COUNTY OF DENVER)

I, Christopher Boone, Digital Reporter and Notary Public within and for the State of Colorado, certify that the foregoing is a correct transcription from the digital recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

I further certify that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which this hearing was taken, and further that I am not financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of the action.

In witness whereof, I have affixed my signature and seal this 8th day of June, 2007.

My commission expires August 16, 2010.

CHRISTOPHER BOONE NOTARY PUBLIC STATE OF COLORADO

Christopher Boone, Digital Reporter